

**REMARKS**

Claims 23-30 are pending in the application, claims 1-22 being canceled herein.

**Claims 1-22 variously over Cromer, Haartsen, Wynn, Nerlikar and Weller**

Claims 1-3 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,286,102 to Cromer et al. ("Cromer") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,026,297 to Haartsen ("Haartsen"); claims 4, 11-14 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Cromer in view of Haartsen and U.S. Pat. No. 5,717,867 to Wynn et al. ("Wynn"); claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Cromer in view of Haartsen and U.S. Pat. No. 5,629,981 to Nerlikar ("Nerlikar"); and claims 15, 16, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Cromer in view of Haartsen, Wynn and U.S. Pat. No. 5,448,221 to Weller ("Weller").

Claims 1-22 are canceled herein, making the rejections in this regard now moot. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

New claims 23-30 recite a telephone answering device that answers an incoming telephone call if a user is NOT present as determined by piconet communications with a piconet device uniquely associated with the user. None of the cited art, either alone or in combination, teaches such an answering device. In fact, none of the cited art even teaches a telephone answering device.

In particular, the Examiner's main reference Cromer teaches selective disablement of a computer when passing through a security checkpoint. Clearly, Cromer is quite distant to-if at all relevant-to a telephone answering device as recited by claims 23-30.

Haartsen teaches contemporaneous connectivity to multiple piconets. The Examiner cites Haartsen merely for its use of a piconet. (Office Action at 2). The Examiner continues to fail to cite ANY MOTIVATION to have combined Haartsen with ANY of the other numerous cited references. The ONLY guidance the Examiner provides for Haartsen is that it "discloses operation

of wireless device through a piconet network (see fig. 3).” (Office Action at 2) Besides that, which is obvious, there is no reason why a person of skill in the art with Cromer before them would have looked to piconets AT ALL. Haartsen builds upon piconet technology, but there is no motivation in Cromer to have looked to a piconet in the first place. Thus, Haartsen can not be properly combined with Cromer with respect to claims 23-30.

Wynn teaches an employee time entry and accounting system. A person of skill in the art of telephone answering devices would NOT have looked to a time entry system. Wynn cannot be properly combined with Haartsen and/or Cromer with respect to the claims of the present invention.

Nerlikar teaches a security system. Nerlikar fails to teach or relate to a telephone answering device as claimed.

Weller teaches an alarm apparatus for persons under house arrest. Weller teaches no functionality or association with a telephone answering device as claimed.

### **Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336